

JUL 02 2008

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JORGE CORTES MACEDO; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-71954

Agency Nos. A96-064-388
A96-064-389

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted June 18, 2008^{**}

Before: REINHARDT, LEAVY, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Jorge Cortes Macedo and Yesenia Orozco De La Paz, natives and citizens of
Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' decision

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

affirming the immigration judge's denial of petitioners' application for cancellation of removal.

We lack jurisdiction to consider petitioners' challenge to the agency's extreme hardship determination because it is a nonreviewable discretionary determination. *See Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 87, 890 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)). Petitioners' contention, that the BIA violated their due process rights by concurring with the IJ's decision without conducting its own separate analysis, does not amount to a colorable constitutional claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005); *Lopez v. Ashcroft*, 366 F.3d 799, 807 n.6 (9th Cir. 2004) ("what is required is merely that [the BIA] consider the issues raised, and announce its decision in terms sufficient to enable a reviewing court to perceive that it has heard and thought and not merely reacted.").

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.